

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 have been examined. With this amendment, Applicant is canceling claims 14-26 and adding claims 27-29. Claims 1-13 and 27-29 are all the claims pending in the application.

**1. Formalities**

Further to the Interview Summary attached to the Office Action of December 23, 2003, Applicant confirms the election, as set forth herein. Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the election of Group I (claims 1-13). Applicant is canceling non-elected claims 14-26. Applicant reserves the right to file Divisional Applications directed to non-elected claims 14-26.

Applicant notes that the Examiner has not acknowledged the claim for foreign priority nor confirmed that the certified copies of the priority documents submitted on July 23, 2001, have been received. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge the claim for foreign priority in the next Office Action.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing the references listed on form PTO-1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on August 1, 2002.

**2. Specification**

The Examiner has objected to the specification because the Title is allegedly not descriptive. Applicant has rewritten the Title.

### **3. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wajima (US 6,498,613) ["Wajima"]. For at least the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejections.

Claim 1 recites that an image processing method comprises the step of "performing processing by said computer graphics algorithm at a higher drawing level than said particular drawing level which was selected." The Examiner contends that Wajima discloses this feature.

Wajima relates to a user interface for accessing data stored in hierarchal menus. Wajima discloses an apparatus for selecting items on a menu of application software adapted for use in a computer. An image of a cabinet with cabinet holders is displayed and the size of the cabinet holder is altered based on the degree to which the holder is drawn out (see Figs. 2B and 7). Fundamentally, the user interface of Wajima bears no relation to the present invention.

Nonetheless, the Examiner cites cols. 5 and 6 to support the rejection. Wajima discloses that the "drawing level" represents the degree that a cabinet holder is drawn open (col. 5, lines 33-35). The drawing level is fixed for any particular opening. For example, a "0" indicates that the drawer is closed and "1" value indicates that a drawer is open to the first stage (col. 5, lines 36-38). The drawing level is used to indicate the index icon associated with the drawing level and the amount of enlargement of the cabinet holder (col. 5, lines 43-63).

Applicant submits that, to the extent that Wajima discloses any processing based on a drawing level, it does so for the current drawing level, not for a higher drawing level as required by the claimed combination.

In addition, the claimed combination requires that the drawing levels be set "based on at least one of an amount of computation processing, an amount of data and a display resolution." The Examiner contends that Wajima discloses that the drawing level is set based on "an amount of computation processing." Applicant submits that the Examiner's contention is not supported in Wajima. The amount of computation processing would have no bearing on the drawing level since its value is completely dependent on the amount the drawer is opened as discussed above.

Wajima further lacks processing of higher levels based on editing data at the drawing level. The particular movement between high and low levels in the file management has no inter-relation. Moreover, the processing is not based on any editing data.

Because claims 2-6, 9 and 10 depend on claim 1, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

#### **4. Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 7, 8 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wajima in view of Bellamy et al. (4,253,146) ["Bellamy"]. For at the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejections.

Because claims 7, 8 and 11-13 depend on claim 1 and Bellamy does not cure the deficiencies of Wajima with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

In addition, Applicant submits that the Examiner's proffered explanation as to why it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Wajima and Bellamy is not supported. The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use the

communications line for other signals and Wajima teaches the use of the communication line for other programs.

Although Wajima discloses that other programs may use the communications line 9 (Figure 1), it is in the context of communicating with CPU 1 (col. 3, 54-57), not in the context of selected portions of the Menu Display Program being run on a different CPU. There is absolutely no disclosure or suggestion in Wajima that selected portions of the Menu Display Apparatus are even capable of being run on a separate processor. Therefore, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to combine the teachings of these references.

Additionally, the Examiner's contention that it would be obvious to use the requesting processor and timing means of Bellamy to modify the higher drawing levels associated with a cabinet is also not supported since, as stated above, the drawing level is just an indication of the degree that the drawer of the cabinet holder is open. The Examiner has not explained why it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to use a different processor and timing to represent just this value.

## **5. New Claims**

With this amendment, Applicants adds claims 27-29. Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency, as well as the features set forth therein.

## **6. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
APPLICATION NO.: 09/828,474

Attorney Docket No.: Q63869

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER



Bhaskar Kakarla  
Registration No. 54,627

Date: March 23, 2004